

***Amendments to the Drawings***

Attached to this Response are replacement drawings for FIGs. 2 and 6.

FIG. 2 was amended to correct the "No" branch of block 203, which was pointing toward block 203 instead of away from block 203. Support for this amendment is found in the Specification, page 7, lines 4-7. Figure 2 was also amended to provide arrows for all connecting lines between blocks 201, 203, 205, 207, 209, and 211. Support for this amendment is found in the Specification, page 6, line 16 – page 7, line 7.

Figure 6 was amended to correct a reference numeral. Reference numeral 10 should have been reference numeral 610. Support for this amendment is found in the Specification, page 13, lines 24-25.

No new matter has been added to Figures 2 and 6. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner consider and accept the replacement drawings for Figures 2 and 6.

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. The Specification has been amended to correct minor grammatical and typographical errors. Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-30 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 14, 21, and 27 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20-24 and 26-30 are sought to be amended. Claims 2 and 3 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is embraced by this amendment and its entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above Amendment and the remarks set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

***In the Specification***

The Specification has been amended to correct grammatical and typographical errors and to correct reference numerals and names associated with reference numerals. No new matter has been added to the Specification. Applicant respectfully requests that the amendments to the Specification be entered.

***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

The Examiner, on page 1 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 1-13 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that the claim language in claims 1 and 7 is not clearly understood.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner states that “it is not clearly understood the relationship between the stack of tasks, a queued task [executable] and a queued task.” Applicant has amended claim 1 to overcome this rejection. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider amended claim 1 and withdraw this rejection.

With respect to claim 7, the Examiner states that “it is not clearly indicated what a taskq is and how it relates with executed queued tasks. Applicant has amended claim 7 to overcome this rejection. Applicant directs the Examiner to the page 4, line 24 – page 5, line 15 of the Specification for a detailed explanation of “taskq”. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider amended claim 7 and withdraw this rejection.

***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,823,351 to Flood *et al.* (hereinafter “Flood”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Examiner states that Flood teaches the invention substantially as claimed. The Examiner further states on pages 2-3 of the Office Action that:

Flood does not explicitly teach that a second stack of tasks associated with a second thread. However, Flood teaches a separate work queue ... is created for each thread (col. 4, lines 26-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that in fact Flood’s system provide a second stack of tasks associated with a second thread because it would minimize[s] interrupting or blocking of the owner’s operation.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Flood does not teach or suggest every element of Applicant's invention. For example, Flood does not teach or suggest at least Applicant's element of: "determining if the second stack of tasks contains a task executable by the first thread by examining a bit mask, wherein the bit mask is locked before the bit mask is examined.

Unlike the present invention, Flood does not lock the bit mask before the bit mask is examined. Instead, Flood teaches locking a queue with work and locking overflow data. *Flood*, col. 4, lines 18-20; col. 12, lines 11-13.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant's claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 4-13), are patentable over Flood. Independent claims 14, 21, and 27 include a similar element as that recited in claim 1. Thus, for at least this reason, independent claims 14, 21, and 27, and the claims that depend therefrom, are also patentable over Flood. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-30.

Paul M. Petersen  
Appl. No. 09/991,017

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

**/Crystal D. Sayles, Reg. No. 44,318/**

Crystal D. Sayles  
Senior Attorney  
Intel Americas, Inc.  
(202) 986-3179

Dated: June 1, 2005

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to:  
**Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

On: June 1, 2005

Signature

Rachael Brown

Date

5/1/05